

Remarks

1. Summary of Office Action

In the Final Office Action mailed January 24, 2008, the Examiner rejected claim 1-6, 8-10, and 11-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and rejected claims 1-6 and 8-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner also objected to drawing Figure 2 under 37 C.F.R. § 183(a), and objected to claims 1, 11, 13, and 17 for various informalities.

Finally, the Examiner stated that claims 1-6 and 8-24 would all be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and/or 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

2. Telephone Interview with the Examiner

In view of the Examiner's comments regarding allowable subject matter, the undersigned requested and was granted a telephone interview with the Examiner on April 30, 2008 for the purpose of achieving agreement on appropriate amendments to the claims that would make them allowable. During the interview, all then-pending claims (1-6 and 8-24) were discussed with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and/or 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. No prior art, nor any issues related to prior art was discussed. As a result of the interview, and follow-up telephone conversations on May 2, 2008 and May 8, 2008, the undersigned and the Examiner did agree on specific changes to the wording and terminology that would overcome the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and/or 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and would, if incorporated by way of amendments, thereby place all claims in a condition for allowance. Agreement was also reached regarding overcoming the objections noted in the Summary of the Office Action above.

All of the amendments to the claims, specification, and drawings described in the present response are based substantially on the agreement reached between the undersigned and the Examiner.

3. Status of the Drawings and the Specification

Applicants have revised Figure 2 so that step numbers 225 and 230 are reversed from the original version of this figure. That is, step 225 now reads “Server stores call park number as reference” and step 230 now reads “Server parks call at Second User Agent”. With this revision, Figure 2 more accurately corresponds with the claims, and overcomes the Examiner’s objections to Figure 2. A replacement drawing sheet for Figure 2 is submitted herewith, in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d).

Applicants have amended the specification to reflect the revision to drawing Figure 2.

No new matter has been introduced by either the revision to Figure 2 or the amendment to the specification.

4. Status of the Claims

Presently pending are claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-13, 15, 17-22, and 24 of which claims 1, 11, and 17 are independent, and the remainder are dependent. Claims 10, 14, 16, and 23 have been cancelled (claim 7 was cancelled in a previous response). Various claims have been amended as follows.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter they regard as their invention. Specifically, Applicants’ amendment describes the step of registering the call park number as “registering the call park number as a reference for the first communication session.” Support for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 14, lines 7-9 of the original specification. Similarly, Applicants’

amendment describes the step of establishing a second communication as “using the call park number.” Support for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 14, lines 15-18 of the original specification. Applicants have further amended claim 1 to include “using the address of the first user agent” in the step of establishing a third communication session. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 14, lines 20-21 of the original specification. Other minor changes to claim 1 have been made to improve clarity.

Applicants have also amended claims 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, and 9, all of which depend from claim 1, in order to more clearly specify the relationships of the steps of the dependent claims to those of base claim 1, as well as to ensure consistency of antecedent basis of terms and improve clarity.

Applicants have amended each of claims 11 and 17 in a manner similar to the amendments described in connection with claim 1.

Applicants have also amended claims 12, 13 and 15, each of which depends from claim 11, in order to more clearly specify the relationships of the steps of the dependent claims to those of base claim 11, as well as to ensure consistency of antecedent basis of terms and improve clarity. Similarly, Applicants have amended claims 18, 19, 20, 22, and 24, each of which depends from claim 17, in order to more clearly specify the relationships of the steps of the dependent claims to those of base claim 17, as well as to ensure consistency of antecedent basis of terms and improve clarity.

Applicants have also canceled claims 10, 14, 16, and 23, as noted above.

No new matter has been added by way of any of the above-described amendments.

5. Response to Objections

The Examiner objected to drawing Figure 2 under 37 C.F.R. § 183(a), and objected to claims 1, 11, 13, and 17 for various informalities. As noted above, Applicants' amendments to the claims, specification, and drawings are based substantially on agreement between Applicants' undersigned representative and the Examiner. As such, all of the Examiner's objections are overcome by way of the amendments and drawing revision submitted herewith. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all objections in the present Final Office Action.

6. Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs

The Examiner rejected claim 1-6, 8-10, and 11-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and rejected claims 1-6 and 8-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As noted above, Applicants' amendments to the claims are based substantially on agreement between Applicants' undersigned representative and the Examiner. As such, all of the Examiner's rejections of the claims are overcome by way of the claim amendments submitted herewith. Applicants submit that all pending claims are therefore allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all the claim rejections in the present Final Office Action.

Applicants note that in the present Final Office Action, the Examiner stated that she was not persuaded by Applicants' amendments and arguments made in the previous response filed on November 13, 2007. As such, Applicants note that the Examiner's determination of patentability of the present claims was not based on the amendments and arguments.

8. Conclusion

Applicants submit that the application is in good and proper form for allowance and therefore respectfully request favorable reconsideration. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent, at 312-913-3353.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDonnell Boehnen
Hulbert & Berghoff LLP**

Date: May 14, 2008

By: David A. Grabelsky
David A. Grabelsky
Reg. No. 59,208